



Corvallis Fire Department
314 NW Fourth Street
Corvallis, OR 97330-4887

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL



On Your Side . . . Working Smarter

February 12, 1993

FEB 25 1993

FCC - MAIL ROOM

Federal Communications Commission
1919 "M" Street, Suite 222
Washington, DC 20554

ATTN: COMMENTS ON DOCKET 92-235

Dear Reader:

I am writing on behalf of the Corvallis, Oregon, Fire Department, Corvallis Ambulance Service (serving all of Benton County), and the fire departments and districts of Benton County.

FCC Docket 92-235, if implemented, would, as I understand it:

1. reduce transmitter output power, requiring the outlay of considerable public funds to add transmitters and sites to provide the same coverage; and
2. require (potentially) replacement of all hand-held, mobile, and fixed-base equipment, at tremendous cost, with what appears to be performance inferior to that of the existing system.

I understand this proposed requirement is the result of overcrowding of certain bandwidths in heavily populated areas. It would seem illogical to force the public safety agencies of the entire nation to correct a problem which is experienced in only a few areas. In the states of Oregon and Washington, there are probably only two areas (Portland and Seattle) which even come close to experiencing these problems.

With increasing demands being placed on local agencies and with dwindling resources available, providing such services as emergency medical services and fire protection, which

Federal Communications Commission
February 12, 1993
Page Two

We strongly encourage you to consider alternative means to accomplish this target and also to extend the unrealistic timeframe for whatever compliance means you choose. Perhaps defining and targeting metropolitan areas for earlier implementation, with progressively-tiered compliance dates for less populated areas would be a workable alternative.

Public safety communication priority ranks second only to national defense as established by both statute and court decision. I agree with the January APCO report and the comments indicating concern that the FCC's proposals in this proceeding are inconsistent